UNITED NATIONS

DP

Governing Council of the United Nations Development Programme

Distr.
GENERAL

DP/1993/65
19 April 1993

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Fortieth session
1-18 June 1993, New York
Item 4 (a) of the provisional agenda

PROGRAMME PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION

Country, intercountry and global programmes

Case-by-case project approval

Report of the Administrator

SUMMARY

This brief report discusses the framework in which the Administrator undertakes to approve projects on a case-by-case basis in countries where there has been a disruption in the conditions required for country programming. The Governing Council, at its special session in February 1993, decided to discuss this matter of case-by-case project approval at its fortieth session. This report has been prepared to serve as background for that discussion.

93-22504 (E) 100593

100593

/...

I. INTRODUCTION

1. At its special session in February 1993, the Governing Council decided to discuss the general question of project approval on a case-by-case basis at its fortieth session in June 1993.

II. STATUS

2. Case-by-case project approval is distinct from one- and two-year extensions of country programmes. The request for an extension of a country programme is made when there is every expectation that a new country programme can be formulated, but more time is required to consult on strategy and, in some cases, to agree on cost-sharing and other funding arrangements. The extension of a country programme allows for the continuation of ongoing activities which are still considered to be priorities, as well as for moving in new directions as appropriate. Indicative planning figure (IPF) funds are committed during the period of the extension on a limited basis. The Administrator may approve an extension for one year, but the Governing Council must authorize an extension for a second year.

3. Case-by-case project approval, on the other hand, is opted for in countries where there has been an emergency or extreme situation of instability as a result of political unrest, conflict or natural disaster. In these situations, the normal conditions for UNDP country programming have been disrupted or the country programme is no longer deemed to be relevant in the changed circumstances. In some extreme instances, the United Nations security rating prevents field personnel from operating in the country.

4. UNDP experience in such countries allows it to be able to respond quickly to the changed situation. In doing so, UNDP typically works closely with other United Nations agencies, non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and other indigenous groups to develop, on a consensual basis, a short-term plan of action. Frequently a comprehensive needs assessment is carried out to guide donor response to the requirements of the country. In cases where humanitarian assistance is called for, UNDP works closely with the United Nations Department for Humanitarian Affairs and other relief agencies.

5. The decision to advocate case-by-case project approval typically arises when there has been an assessment by UNDP and the Government, in consultation with the Governing Council, that the situation in the country is such that the UNDP country programme can no longer be implemented and conditions are not ripe to formulate and set into motion a new country programme. Nevertheless, the need is recognized for UNDP assistance, often in support of relief operations, but also for further rehabilitation and reconstruction and for coordination of external assistance. In such circumstances, the Administrator may be authorized, on an exceptional basis, to approve projects as appropriate without benefit of a country programme framework until such time as the situation in the country normalizes.

6. Assistance in countries where projects are being approved on a case-by-case basis is frequently targeted to groups that have been hardest hit by the

conflict or disaster - often women, children, the disabled, demilitarized personnel and displaced persons. Project activities include, for example, restoration of basic infrastructure and capacity for food production, of water supply and sanitation facilities and of irrigation. Shelter, food and medical assistance are often made available, as are opportunities for training and retraining.

7. With the resumption of political stability, adequate security for field personnel and conditions in which development can again be perceived as a priority national objective, UNDP seeks immediately to re-establish the country programming process.

8. In its decision 92/25 of 26 May 1992, the Governing Council authorized the Administrator to approve projects on a project-by-project basis for eight countries: Afghanistan, Cambodia, Haiti, Kuwait, Lebanon, Liberia, Myanmar and the former Yugoslavia. In paragraph 4 of its decision 93/4 of 19 February 1993, the Council took note of the Administrator's intention to continue to approve projects on a case-by-case basis for Somalia, pending normalization of the situation in the country, and requested the Administrator to report orally to the Council at its fortieth session on the results and progress of UNDP efforts in Somalia and to submit a written report on progress and results to the Council at its special session in February 1994. The following table indicates the resources available in the countries being assisted on a project-by-project basis and the approved budgets for the fifth IPF cycle as of March 1993.

9. The Administrator will continue to inform the Council of situations in which project-by-project approval has become necessary and seek the Council's agreement to commit IPF resources outside the established country programme framework on an exceptional basis pending normalization of the situation in the country.

Country	(1) Fourth cycle IPF Carry-over	(2) Fifth cycle IPF	(1) + (2) Total resources available during fifth cycle a/	Approved IPF fifth cycle budgets as of March 1993
Afghanistan	43.1	70.0	113.1	42.7
Cambodia	53.0	51.6	104.6	21.6
Haiti	6.3	37.7	44.0	17.7
Kuwait b/	-	-	-	-
Lebanon	11.3	7.7	19.0	4.8
Liberia	0.4	21.5	21.9	6.7
Myanmar	32.9	93.4	126.3	24.7
Somalia	5.5	57.0	62.5	21.8
Yugoslavia (former)	0.6	2.0	2.6	0.2
TOTAL	153.1	340.9	494.0	121.6

a/ It should be noted that only 75 per cent of the fifth cycle IPFs plus all of fourth cycle carry-overs are currently available for programme planning purposes.

b/ Kuwait is a net contributor to the programme and does not receive an IPF.